

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the claims were grouped as follows: Group I, claims 1-24 and 27-30 drawn to an assay method; Group II, claim 25 to a polynucleotide sensing solution; and Group III, claim 26, drawn to a kit. Restriction was made between the inventions.

A requirement for species election was also made for the following claim features should Group I be elected: the multichromophore; the signaling chromophore; the target polynucleotide; and whether the sample comprises single-stranded or double-stranded polynucleotide.

Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-24 and 27-32. Applicants elect the multichromophore species "conjugated polymer"; to the extent a further election may be required, Applicants elect the structure of claim 9. Applicants elect the signaling chromophore species "fluorescent dye"; to the extent a further election may be required, Applicants elect "fluorescein". Applicants elect the target polynucleotide species "RNA". Applicants elect the sample species as that comprising "single-stranded polynucleotide". Claims reading on the elected species are asserted to be at least claims 1-2, 6, 9, 12-15, 17-18, 21, 22-24, 27-28, and 30-32.

In this response, claims 11 and 25-26 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 15, 19 and 29 have been amended, all without prejudice. Claims 31-32 have been added. No new matter is added. Claims 15, 19 and 29 have been amended for clarity and are supported by the claims and application as filed. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found throughout the application as filed, including in the original claims, in the examples, and in the section "Excitation and Detection of the Chromophores" beginning at page 28 line 5.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David W. Maher, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 40,077